

Preface.

i -V

He who engages in the development of the human mind, from the beginning of civilization to our own ways, will have a remarkable result. For he will find that reason first conceived the indisputable power of nature, always fragmented, and personified the individual expressions of power, Thus forming gods; Then these gods were melted together into a single god; Then, by means of the most abstract thought, made this God into a being that was in no way conceivable; But at last it became critical, tore apart its fine whip, and put the real individual on the throne, the fact of the inner and outer experience.

The stations of this route are:

- 1) polytheism,
- 2) Monotheism - pantheism,
 - a. Religious pantheism,
 - b. Philosophical do.
- 3) Atheism.

Not all cultural peoples have traveled all the way. The spiritual life of most has remained at the first or second developmental point, and only in i-VITwo countries were reached: India and Judea.

The religion of the Indians was initially polytheism, then pantheism. (Des religious pantheism seized later very fine and important heads and trained him for philosophical pantheism [Vedanta].) Since Budha, the magnificent King's son entered, and founded in his great *Karma* -Teaching atheism to belief in the omnipotence of individual. Likewise, the religion of the Jews was first crude polytheism, then strict monotheism. In him, as in pantheism, the individual lost the last trace of independence. If, as Schopenhauer very aptly remarked, Jehovah had tormented his very powerless creature sufficiently, he threw them on the dung. On the other hand, critical reason reacted with elemental force in the sublime personality of Christ. Christ reintroduced the individual into his unchanging right, and based on it, and based on the belief in the movement of the world from life to death (the downfall of the world), founded the atheistic religion of redemption. That pure Christianity is, at bottom, genuine atheism (ie denial of a personal God coexisting with the world, but affirmation of a vast atheism of a pre-worldly dead divinity that permeates the world) and only on the surface is monotheism.

Exoteric Christianity became world religion, and |i-VII According to his triumph, the above-mentioned mental development has not taken place in any individual nation.

In addition to the Christian religion, in the communion of the Western nations, the Western philosophy came, and has now come near to the third station. It was connected with Aristotelian philosophy, which had been preceded by the Ionic. In this, individual, visible individualities of the world (water, air, fire) have been made into principles of the whole, similarly, as in every primitive religion, individual observed activities of nature have been designed to be gods. The simple unity gained in the Aristotelian philosophy, by the combination of all forms, was then transformed into the philosophically justified God of the Christian Church in the Middle Ages (the pure Christianity had long since been lost); Because scholasticism is nothing other than philosophical monotheism.

This was then transformed into philosophical pantheism by Scotus Erigena, Vanini, Bruno, and Spinoza, who, on the one hand, led to pantheism without a process (Schopenhauer) under the influence of a particular philosophical branch (the critical idealism: Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Kant) Pantheism with development (Schelling, Hegel) was further developed, ie pushed to the top.

In this philosophical pantheism (it is no matter whether the simple unity in the world is called will or idea, or absolute or matter) move i-VIII Present, like the distinguished Indians in the time of Vedantaphilosophy, the most educated of civilized peoples whose basis is Western civilization. But

now the day of the reaction has come. The individual demands, more loudly than ever, the restoration of his torn and crushed but undeliverable right. The present work is the first attempt to give it to him fully. The philosophy of redemption is the continuation of the teachings of Kant and Schopenhauer and confirmation of Budhaism and pure Christianity. These philosophical systems are corrected and supplemented, and these religions are reconciled with it by science. It does not base atheism upon any belief, like these religions, but as philosophy, on knowledge, and therefore atheism has been scientifically established by it for the first time. He will also pass into the knowledge of mankind; For this is ripe for him: she has become mature.

Analytics of Knowledge.

i 1

The more familiar the data are, the harder it is to get them
A new and yet correct way to combine, since already
An exceedingly large number of heads at them
And the possible combinations of the same
Has exhausted.

Schopenhauer.

1.

The true philosophy must be purely immanent, that is, their material both as its limit must be the world. It must explain the world of principles, which can be recognized by every human being, and can not help either out-of-the-world powers, of which absolutely nothing can be known, or powers in the world, which, however, by their very nature can not be recognized call. True philosophy must also be idealistic, that is, it must not overthrow the knowing subject, and speak of things as though they are the same as the eye, independent of an eye which she sees, a hand which she feels Sees the hand she feels. Before she dares take a step to solve the enigma of the world, she must have carefully and precisely investigated the ability to know. It may be that: *1.* That the discerning subject produces the world entirely from his own means; *Second*, That the subject perceives the world just as it is; *Third*, That the world is a product, partly a subject, a part independent of the subject, of the phenomenon.

The output from the subject is thus the beginning of the only safe way to the truth. It is possible, as I may say here, that the philosopher must also make a leap over the subject; But such a method, which gives everything to chance, would be unworthy of a prudent thinker.

Second

The sources from which all experience, all knowledge, all our knowledge flows, are: 1) The senses,
2) The self-consciousness. There is no third source.

Third

We first consider sensuous knowledge. - A tree standing in front of me throws straight back the beams of light which strike him. Some of them fall into my eye and make an impression on the retina, which the excited optic nerve transmits to the brain. I touch a stone, and the sentient senses redirect the sensations received to the brain. A bird sings and thus produces a wave movement in the air. A few waves hit my ear, the eardrum trembled, and the auditory nerve gave the impression of being brains.

I take the scent of a flower. It touches the mucous membranes of the nose and excites the nerve nerve, which brings the impression to the brain. A fruit arouses my taste-buds, and they take the impression of the brains. The function of the senses is, therefore, the transmission of impressions to the brain. Since, however, these impressions are of a very definite nature, and the product of a reaction, which is likewise a function, it is advisable to separate the sense into the sense-organ and the apparatus of conduction. Accordingly, the function of the organs of sense should simply be placed in the production of the specific impression, and the function of the conduction apparatus, as above, in the transmission of the definite impression.

4th

The sensuous impressions transferred from the brain to the outside are ideas; The totality of this is the world as an idea. It disintegrates into: 1) The intuitive idea, or briefly the intuition; 2) The non-intuitive perception. The former is based on the facial sense and partly on the | i 5 Sense of touch (feeling); The latter on the sense of hearing, smell, and taste, as well as partly on the feeling.

5th

We now have to see how the intuitive notion, the intuition, arises for us, and begin with the impression which the tree has made in the eye. More has not yet happened. There has been a certain change in the retina, and this change has affected my brain. If nothing else were done, the process would be ended, my eye would never see the tree; For how could the weak change in my nerves be made into a tree in me, and in what wonderful way should I see it? But the brain reacts to the impression, and the faculty of knowledge, which we call understanding, comes into action. The understanding seeks the cause of change in the sense-organ, and this transition from the action in the senseorgan to the cause is its sole function, is the law of causality. This function is congenital to the understanding, and lies in its essence before all experience, as the stomach must have the ability to digest before the first food comes into it. If the law of causation were not the *a priori* function of the understanding, we would never arrive at an intuition. The law of causality is, according to the senses, the first condition for the possibility of conception and therefore is *a priori* in us. On the other hand, however, the intellect would never be able to function, and would be a dead, useless intelligence if it were not aroused by causes. If the causes which lead to intuition lie in the senses, as are the effects, they must be brought forth in us by an unknowable, omnipotent, alien hand, which must reject the immanent philosophy. It remains, therefore, only the assumption that completely independent causes are produced by the subject in the organs of sense, that is, independent things put into operation the understanding. Thus certainly the law of causality lies in us, and indeed before all experience, so on the other hand is the existence of things in themselves, independent of the subject, whose effectiveness first sets the mind into function.

6th

The mind searches for the sensation of the sense, and by following the direction of the incident beams of light, it reaches it. He would, however, perceive nothing unless there were in him, before all experience, forms in which he poured the cause, as it were. One is the space. When one speaks of space, one usually emphasizes that he has three dimensions: height, width, and depth, and is infinite, that is, it is impossible to imagine that space has a limit, and the certainty of never being in its measurement To come to an end is just his infinity. That the infinite space exists independently of the subject, and that its limitation, the spatiality, belongs to the essence of things, is a view which is surmounted by critical philosophy and which originates from the naive childhood of mankind, which would be a useless work. There is neither an infinite space nor finite spaces outside of the observing

subject. But the room is also not a pure *a priori* intuition of the subject, nor has this pure *a priori* intuition of finite space, through whose concatenation it the perception of an all comprehensive and could reach some space, as I will prove in the Appendix.

The space as a form of the intellect (of the mathematical space is now not the speech) is a point, ie the space as a form of the understanding is to be thought only under the image of a point. This point has the ability (or almost the ability of the subject) to limit the things which affect the sense organs in question in three directions. Thus the essence of the room is the ability to interact in three dimensions in an indeterminate length apart (in indefinitum). Where a thing in itself ceases to function, space sets its limits, and space does not have the power to extend it to its very first extent. It is completely indifferent in respect of expansion. It is equally pleasing to give a palace like a quartz grain, a horse like a bee the border. The thing in itself determines him to unfold as far as it does.

i 7 If on the one hand the (point) space is a condition of the possibility of experience, an *a priori* form of our knowledge, then on the other hand it is certain that every thing in itself has a completely independent sphere of activity from the subject. This is not determined by space, but it is intended to limit the space exactly where it ceases.

7th

The second form, which the understanding takes to help the found cause, is matter. It is likewise to be thought of under the image of a point (the substance is not mentioned here). It is the ability to accurately and faithfully objectify every property of things in themselves, any special efficacy, within the form drawn by space; For the object is nothing other than the thing passed through the forms of the subject in itself. Without the object no object, no objects no external world. With the intention of the division of meaning in sense-organism and conduction-apparatus described above, matter is to be defined as the point where the transmitted sense-impressions, which are the processed special effects of intuitive things in themselves, unite. Matter is, therefore, the common form for all sensory impressions, or else the sum of all the sensuous impressions of things in themselves of the intuitive world. Matter is therefore a further condition of the possibility of experience, or an *a priori* form of our knowledge. It stands, completely independently, the sum of the efficacies of a thing in itself, or, in a word, the force. Insofar as a force is the object of the perception of a subject, it is matter (objective power); On the other hand, every force, independent of a perceptive subject, is free of matter and only force. Note well, therefore, that, as accurate and photographically faithful to the subjective form of matter reproduces the specific modes of action of a thing in itself, the only use for rendering but *toto genere* of the force is different. The form of an object is identical with the sphere of activity of the object underlying it, but the objectified by matter i 8 The expressions of power of the thing in itself are not identical with these, in their essence. There is also no resemblance, which is why one can only draw with the greatest reservation a picture for clarification and say that matter represents the qualities of things, as a colored mirror shows objects, or the object is related to the thing itself as one Marble floor to a clay model. The essence of power is just the nature of matter *toto genere* different. Certainly, the redness of an object points to a special property of the thing itself, but the redness does not have equality with this property. It is quite clear that two objects, one of which is smooth and pliable, the other rough and brittle, make distinctions appear in the essence of the two things in themselves; But the smoothness, the roughness, the flexibility, and the brittleness of objects, with the respective properties of things, have in themselves no equality of being.

We therefore have to explain here that the subject is a major factor in the production of the external world, although it does not falsify the effect of a thing in itself, but only exactly reproduces what is working on it. It is here the object of the thing-in-itself, the phenomenon different from that which

appears in it. Thing in itself and subject make the object. But it is not space which distinguishes the object from the thing in itself, nor is it the time, as I shall show immediately, but matter alone produces the gulf between the appearing and its appearance, although matter is entirely Indifferent, and can not, by his own means, place a property in the thing itself, or strengthen or weaken its effectiveness. It simply objectivizes the given sense-impression, and it does not matter whether it has to render the fundamental property of the thing, which is the basis of the most screaming red, or the softest blue, the greatest hardness, or the full softness; But it can present the impression only by its nature, and here, therefore, the knife must be employed in order to make the right, so exceedingly important, cut through the ideal and the real.

i 9

8th.

The work of the understanding is terminated with the discovery of the cause for the corresponding change in the sense-organ, and with its infiltration into its two forms space and matter (objectification of the cause). Both forms are equally important and support each other. I emphasize that without the space we would have no successive objects, that space, on the other hand, can only apply its depth dimension to the tinted colors provided by matter, to shadows and light. The intellect alone, therefore, has to objectify the sense-impressions, and no other capacity of knowledge supports it in its work. But the mind can not deliver finished objects.

9th

The sensuous impressions, which are objectivized by the understanding, are not whole but partial representations. As long as the mind alone is active-which is never the case, since all our capacities of knowledge, the one and the other less, always function together, but a separation is necessary here-only those parts of the tree which clearly represent the center The retina, or such places as are very close to the center. For this reason we continually change the position of our eyes during the observation of the object. Soon we move our eyes from the point of the root to the extreme point of the crown, sometimes from right to left, sometimes reversed, and sometimes we let them glide over a small flower countless times: only to bring every part into contact with the center of the retina. In this way we obtain a number of distinct distinct representations, which, however, can not be joined by the mind to an object. If this is to be done, they must be handed over by the intellect to another faculty of knowledge, reason.

10th

Reason is supported by three faculties: memory, judgment, and imagination. |i 10 All the powers of knowledge, the human mind, are summarized:

The function of reason is synthesis or conjunction as activity. From now on, whenever the function of reason is used, I will use the word synthesis, and, on the other hand, establish a connection for the product, the connected one.

The form of reason is the present.

The function of memory is: to preserve the sensory impressions.

The function of the power of judgment is: the composition of the other.

The function of the imagination is: to hold the intuitions connected by reason as images.

But the function of the mind is, at all events, to accompany the activity of all faculties with consciousness, and to link their knowledge to the point of self-consciousness.

11th

In communion with the power of judgment and imagination, reason stands in the most intimate relations with the mind, for the preparation of the intuition with which we are still exclusively concerned. To begin with, the judging power of reason gives the related representations. This, in turn, connects these (and, for example, those which belong to a leaf, a branch, to the stem), by the fact that the imagination always keeps the connected one a new piece, and that the whole can be held back by the imagination And so on. It then unites the dissimilar, ie, the stem, the branches, the branches, the leaves, and the flowers in a similar manner, and repeats their connections individually and as a whole, according as necessary.

i 11 Reason exercises its function on the almost continuous point of the present, and the time is unnecessary; But the synthesis can also take place in this one: More details later. Imagination carries the respective connected from the present to the present, and reason fits in a piece, always remaining in the present, that is, on the point of the present. The ordinary view is that the understanding is the synthetic faculty; Indeed, there are many who maintain in good faith that synthesis does not take place at all, that every object is immediately understood as a whole. Both views are inaccurate. The mind can not connect because it has only one function: transition from the action in the sense-organ to the cause. But the synthesis itself can never fail, even if one looks at the head of a pin, as a sharp self-observation will show to each; For the eyes will move, albeit almost imperceptibly. The illusion arises chiefly from the fact that we are conscious of finished connections, but are almost always unconsciously active in the synthesis: first, because of the great rapidity with which both the most perfect organ of sense, the eye and impressions are received and the understanding is objectively the same; Reason itself; Secondly, because we remember so little that we, as children, had to learn to apply the synthesis gradually and with great difficulty, just as the depth of the space was at first quite

unknown to us. As we now, upon the opening of the eyelids, immediately perceive every object at the correct distance and itself, in its extent, without flaw, while it is an undisputed fact that the newborn is the moon as well as the pictures of the parlor and the face of the As the colors of a single surface, float close to our eyes, we now at once see the objects, even the largest, as a whole, while we, as infants, certainly saw only parts of objects, and as a result of the slight exercise Of our judgment and imagination, could neither judge the cohesion, nor hold back the vanished parts. The illusion also arises from the fact that most objects, viewed from a suitable distance, take up their whole picture

i 12 The retina are drawn, and the synthesis is so relieved that it escapes the perception. To an attentive self-observer, however, he compels himself irresistibly when he confronts an object in such a way that he does not entirely overlook it, so that perceived parts disappear in the course of the synthesis. It appears even more distinctly, if we pass by a mountain train closely and grasp its entire form. But it is most clearly recognized when we skip the facial sense, and leave the sense of touch alone, as I will show in detail in an appendix.

The Synthesis is an a priori function of the faculty of knowledge and as such a condition *a priori* the possibility of conception. It stands completely independent of it, the unity of the thing in itself, which forces it to connect in a very definite way.

12th

We have not yet fully measured the field of intuition, but must now leave it for a short time.

In this way the visible world arises. It is, however, to be noted that, by the synthesis of partial representations to objects, thinking is by no means brought into intuition. The connection of a given manifold of intuition is, of course, a work of reason, but not a work in terms or concepts, either by pure a priori (categories) or by ordinary concepts.

Reason, however, does not limit its activity to the synthesis of the partial presentations of the understanding to objects. It exercises its function, which is always one and the same, in other fields of which we shall first consider the abstract, the domain of the reflection of the world in concepts.

The representations of the understanding connected to whole objects or to whole parts of objects are compared with the judgment. The same or the like is compiled by it, with the help of the imagination, and handed over to the reason which connects it to a collective unity, the concept. The more similar is the summarized, the closer to the | i 13 The concept stands as an example, and the more easily the transition to an intuitive representative is made. If, on the other hand, the number of the features in the combined objects becomes ever smaller, and the concept is thus always farther and farther, it is the further to the intuition. However, even the broadest concept of his mother's ground is not quite detached, even though it is only a thin and very long thread that holds him. In the same way as reason reflects visible objects in concepts, it also forms, with the aid of memory, concepts from all our other perceptions, of which I shall speak in the following. It is clear that the concepts which are drawn from intuitive representations are made more easily and more quickly than those which originate in non- To have; For, as the eye is the most perfect organ of sense, the imagination is the most powerful faculty of reason.

When the child learns the language, that is, acquires ready-made concepts, it has to perform the same operation which was at all necessary to form concepts. It is only made easier by the finished concept. If it sees an object, it compares it with what is known to it, and composes the like. It thus forms no concept, but subsumes only one concept. If an object is unknown to him, it is without question, and the right concept must be given to him. -

Reason then combines the concepts themselves into judgments, that is, they combine concepts which compose the power of judgment. Moreover, it combines judgments with premises from which a new judgment is drawn. Their method is guided by the known four principles on which the logic is based.

In the abstract sphere, reason thinks, likewise on the point of the present, and not in time. But we must turn to this now. In doing so, we enter an extraordinarily important domain, namely that of the connections of reason on the basis of a priori forms and functions of the faculty of knowledge. Sämtliche compounds which we will get to know, are in the hand of experience, so *a posteriori* emerged.

i 14

13th

Time is a conjunction of reason, and not, as one ordinarily assumes, an a priori form of cognition. The reason of the child accomplishes this connection in the domain of the imagination, as well as on the way into the interior. We now want to let the time arise in the light of consciousness, and choose the latter path, since it is the most suitable for the philosophical investigation, although the inner source of experience has not yet been dealt with. If we detach ourselves from the external world, and submerge ourselves in our inner being, we find ourselves in a continuous elevation and reduction, briefly in an incessant movement. The place where this movement touches our consciousness, I will call the point of movement. On it, the form of reason, the point of the present, floats (or sits as screwed). Where the point of movement is, there is also the point of the present, and this is always exactly above that point. He can not advance ahead of him, and he can not stay behind: both are inextricably linked.

If we examine with attention the process, we find that we are always in the present, but always at the expense or by the death of the present; In other words, we move from present to present.

Now, when the reason becomes conscious of this transition, the imagination keeps the vanishing present and connects it with the evolving. It pushes, as it were, under the rolling, flowing, intimately

connected points of movement and presence a fixed surface on which it reads the path which has passed through, and acquires a series of fulfilled moments, that is, a series of fulfilled transitions from present to present.

In this way it attains the essence and concept of the past. If it then rushes away in the present, for it can not separate it from the point of motion, and advance it before the movement, and if it connects the coming present with the one following it, it gains a series of moments which will be fulfilled. Gains the essence and concept of the future. Is she now connecting the past?

i 15 With the future to an ideal fixed line of indeterminate length, on which the point of the present advances, it has the time. Just as the present is nothing without the point of the movement on which it floats, time is nothing without the foundation of the real movement. The real movement is completely independent of time, or, in other words, the real succession would also take place without the ideal succession. If there were no discerning beings in the world, the existing uncritical things in themselves would nevertheless be in a restless movement. If knowledge emerges, time is only the condition of the possibility of recognizing the movement, or also time is the subjective criterion of movement.

Above the point of the movement of the individual is the point of the present, in the case of knowing beings. The point of the single motion stands next to the points of all other individual motions, that is, all the individual motions form a general movement of uniform succession. The presence of the subject always indicates precisely the point of the movement of all things in themselves.

14th

We go, the important *a posteriori* - Connection time in hand, back to view. I have said above that the synthesis of partial representations is independent of the time when reason, on the moving point of the present, accomplishes its connections, and the imagination keeps the connected. But the synthesis can also take place in time when the subject draws his attention to it. It is no different with changes which can be perceived on the point of the present.

There are two kinds of change. One is change of location and the other inner change (drive, development). Both combine the higher concept of movement. If the change in position is such that it can be perceived as a displacement of the moving object against stationary objects, its perception does not depend on the time i 16 But is recognized on the point of the present, as the movement of a branch, the flight of a bird.

For the reflective reason, however, all changes, without exception, like the intuition itself, do for a certain time; But, like perception, the perception of such changes is not dependent on the consciousness of time; For the subject recognizes it directly on the point of the present, which is to be noted. Time is an ideal connection; It does not flow, but is an imaginary firm line. Every past moment is as it were frozen and can not be shifted by a hairline. Likewise, every future moment has its definite fixed place on the ideal line. But what is continually moving is the point of the present: it

flows, not time. It would also be quite wrong to say that it is precisely this flow of the present time, For if we pursue only the point of the present, we never get to the idea of time: one always remains in the present. We must look backwards and forwards, and at the same time have fixed embankments, in order to gain the ideal connection time.

On the other hand, changes in the locality, which can not be directly perceived on the point of the present, and all the developments are recognized only by means of time. The movement of the hands of a watch is beyond our perception. If I now recognize that the same pointer was first at 6, then at seven, I must be aware of the succession, that is, in order to be able to attach two contradictorily predicates to the same object, I need time.

This is the case with changes of location, which I might have noticed, but not perceived, in the present

(displacement of an object behind my back), and with developments. Our tree is blossoming. If we now move into the autumn and give the tree fruit, we need the time to recognize the flowering and the early tree as the same object. The same object can be hard and soft, red, and green, but it can always have only one of the two predicates in a present.

i 17

15th

We have now measured the whole field of intuition.

Is it, that is, the totality of spatial- Material objects, the whole world of our experience? No! It is only a part of the world as an idea. We have sensory impressions, the cause of which the understanding, exercising its function, seeks, but which can not be spatially and materially shaped. And yet we also have the notion of non- Intuitive objects and thus, first and foremost, the idea of a collective unit, the universe. How do we get there?

Every mode of action of a thing in itself, in so far as it affects the senses for intuition (facial and tactile sense), is objectivized by the form of matter, ie it becomes material for us. An exception does not take place in any way, and therefore matter is the ideal substrate of all visible objects, which in itself is without quality, but in which all qualities have to appear, similar to the space without expansions, but which traces all forces.

In consequence of this lack of quality of the ideal substratum of all visible objects, reason is offered a similar manifold which links it to the unity of the substance.

The substance is, therefore, as the time to connect *a posteriori* the reason on the basis of an *a priori* shape. With the help of these ideal connection now reason thinks about all those sensations, which can not be pour into the molds of mind, matter and should come in this way to present non-physical objects. These and the physical properties make up a coherent set of substantial objects. Only now the air, colorless gases, smells and sounds are us (*vibrirende* air) to objects, if we can not make spatially and materially the same, and the sentence has now unconditional validity: that everything that makes an impression on our senses, is necessarily substantial.

The unit of the ideal bonding substance is on real areas compared to the universe, the Collectiv unit of forces, which is totally independent of that.

i 18

16th

This leaves the taste sensations. They do not lead to new objects, but to those which are already provided by impressions on other senses. The mind seeks only the cause and then leaves to reason the more. These easy exercises its function and connects the effect with the existing object, eg the taste of a pear with the substantive bite of it in our mouth.

In general only reason can recognize the different emanating from an object effects than a single force sphere *entfließend*; because the mind is not a synthetic assets. -

To sum it all together now, we see that the idea is neither sensual nor intellectual, nor rational, but spiritual. It is the work of the spirit, that of all the faculty of cognition.

17th

As I have shown above, all sensations lead to objects that make up the objective world in its totality. The reason reflects this whole objective world in concepts and wins in addition to the world of immediate perception, a world of abstraction.

Finally, they arrived at a third world, to the world of reproduction, which is located between the first two.

Reason reproduced, separated from the outside world, faded everything perceived by the aid of memory, namely either accomplished entirely new compounds, or turns *Entschwundenenes* accurate but weak and again before. The process is quite the same as with immediate impressions on the senses. The reason quite remembers not complete images, smells, taste sensations, words, sounds, but only of sensations. She calls, with the help of memory, in the sensory nerves (and not what we have to think of as mind at their tips, but where they open into that part of the brain) produces an impression and the mind objectifies him. we take our tree, the mind shapes the impressions that has preserved the memory, to partial ideas that | i 19 judgment, this together, reason connects the Collated that imagination holds the Related fixed and a pale reflection of the tree stands before us. The extraordinary rapidity of the process should not blind us, as I said, lead to the false assumption that an immediate recall of the objects takes place. The process is just as complicated as the emergence of objects on the basis of real effects on the senses.

The dreams occur in a similar manner. They are perfect reproductions. Their objectivity they owe in general, the rest of the sleeping individual and the specifics *Dern* full inactivity of the ends of the sensory nerves.

18th

We have now to consider the rest of the important compounds that, due to a priori functions and forms of the faculty of knowledge, accomplished the reason.

The function of the mind is the transition from the action in the sense organ to the cause. He practices it unconsciously, because the mind does not think. It can also its function not exercise reversed and go from cause to effect, because only an effect puts it into action, and so long is an object for him, that as long as the mind is ever in action, he can come up with nothing more employ, as with the found cause. Set, he could think and wanted to go from cause to effect, would disappear the object at that moment and it could only be recovered, that the mind recently investigated the cause to effect.

The mind can thus expand its function in any way. But reason can.

First, it recognizes the function itself that it recognizes that the function of the mind is to look for the cause of a change in the sense organs. Then the reason sets back the way from cause to effect. So you see two causal relationships:

1) the law of causality, ie the law, that any change in the sensory organs of the subject must have a cause;

2) that things seem to be on the subject.

i 20 In this way the causal relationships of undisputed validity are exhausted, because the knowing subject can not know whether to recognize other beings in the same way, or whether they are subject to other laws. So, however praiseworthy the careful management of critical reason is so reprehensible they would be if they gave up the further penetration into the causal relationships here. You can also not be swayed and stamped first the body of the knowing subject to an object among objects. Based on this knowledge, they arrived at an important third causal relation. Namely, it extends the law of causality (relation between thing in itself and subject) for general causality that I bring into the following formula:

It affects thing in itself on thing in itself and any change in an object must have a cause which precedes the effect in time. (I think intentionally thing in itself and object here apart because although we know that thing works itself on thing in itself, but things can be perceived by the subject only as objects in themselves.)

So by means of general causality reason linked object with the object, ie the general causality is the condition of possibility, the relation in which things in themselves are to each other, to recognize.

Now here is the place to establish the concept of cause. Since thing acts on to the thing in itself, so there is ever only effective causes (*causae efficientes*), which can be one-heal 1) mechanical causes (pressure and shock), 2) stimulation, 3) motives.

The mechanical causes occur mainly in inorganic realms that stimuli mainly in the plant kingdom, the motives only in the animal kingdom on. Further, since the man who time the can look forward to come, he can set goals, that is for the people and for him there are final causes (by virtue *final causes*), or ideal causes. They are, like all other causes, acting, because they can only act whenever they are on the point of the present.

The term accidental cause is to limit the effect that he | i 21 designates only the occasion, which gives a thing in another, to act on a third. Draws a cloud that shrouded the sun, continued and my hand warm, so is the withdrawal of the cloud exciting cause, not the cause itself, the heating of my hand.

19th

The reason further extends the general causality which two things linked (the acting and suffering) to a fourth causal relationships which comprises the validity of all things in themselves, to the Community or interaction. The same states that every thing continuirlich, directly and indirectly, affects all other things in the world, and that at the same time to the same all other continuirlich, directly and indirectly, act, which it follows that no thing may have to be an absolutely independent efficacy.

As the law of causality to set an independent from the subject effectiveness and overall causality for setting the independent from the subject action of things led to another, so the community is only a subjective link virtue recognized what the real dynamic context of the universe becomes. The latter would also be present without a knowing subject; but the subject could he not realize when it would be unable to accomplish the Association of Community in itself, or in other words, the community is the condition of the possibility to capture the dynamic context of the universe.

20th

Reason has now produce only one connection: the mathematical space.

The (point) space is different from the present thereby significantly that he entirely sufficient to bring the vision, while the present is not sufficient to detect Sämmtliche movements of things.

It would therefore appear at all as useless, for construction of a connection between the mathematical space, *a posteriori* to proceed, as is the time. But this is not the | i 22 the case; because mathematical space is essential to human knowledge, because mathematics is based on it, the high value will also recognize one who willingly that her boyfriend is not. Not only is the mathematics, the unshakable basis of various studies, including the all-important for the culture of the human race astronomy, but it is also the cornerstone of art (architecture) and the foundation of art, which in its further development, the social conditions of the people is totally redesign.

Mathematical space created by reason determines the point-space auseinanderzutreten, and then connects any pure space into a whole of indefinite extension. It shall proceed in this case, as in the formation of entire objects from partial ideas.

Mathematical space is the only connection to a priori reason, which does not help determine the thing in itself. Accordingly, it is on real areas not a thing in itself, nor a totality such but absolute nothingness against which we can imagine in any other way than by the mathematical empty space.

21st

Among the manifold relations which has reason to understanding, finally enters this: the appearance, ie to correct the mistake of the mind. So we see the moon on the horizon greater than in height, a stick broken in the water, a star that is already extinguished, even all the stars in places where they actually not on (because the Earth's atmosphere refracts all light and can search the understanding the cause of the sensory impression only in the direction of falling into the eye rays); we mean also that the earth does not move, the planets sometimes stands still or moving back and so what All rights the thinking reason.

22nd

We will now summarize the previous close.

The human faculty of cognition has:

i 23 a. various priori functions and forms, namely:

- 1) the law of causality,
- 2) the (point) area,
- 3) the matter,
- 4) the synthesis,
- 5) the presence,

faced by on real areas, completely independent, the following provisions of the thing itself:

- 1) the efficiency at all,
- 2) the efficacy sphere,
- 3) the pure force
- 4) The unit of each thing in itself,
- 5) the point of movement.

The human faculty of cognition has:

b. different due to a priori functions and forms, bewerkstelligte by reason, ideal connections, respectively.

Connections:

- 1) the time,
- 2) the general causality
- 3) the Community,
- 4) the substance,
- 5) the mathematical space.

The four former correspond to real areas following provisions of things in themselves:

- 1) the real succession,
- 2) the action of a thing in itself to another,
- 3) the dynamic context of the universe,
- 4) the Collectiv unit of space.

The mathematical space is absolute nothingness over. We have also found that the object is appearance of the thing in itself, and that matter alone produces the difference between the two.

23rd

The thing in itself, as far as we have examined it so far is force. The world the totality of things in themselves, is a whole of pure forces, which are the subject to objects. |

i 24 The object is appearance of the thing in itself, and although it depends on the subject, yet we have seen that in any way it falsifies the thing in itself. We must therefore trust the experience. Now what is the strength in yourself, that has not been dealing with us now. We initially remain still on the bottom of the world as representation and consider the force in general, which we anticipate physics as little as

possible. - The law of causality, the function of the mind, always looking for only the cause of a change in the sense organs. Changes in them nothing, so it rests entirely. the other hand, changes a sensory organ by a real effect, so the mind occurs immediately in activity and seeks to effect the cause. Did he find it, the law of causality as it occurs to the side.

The mind, and this is well to remember, is not in a position to continue to apply the law of causality and ask about the cause of the cause, for he does not think. So he will never abuse the law of causality; also is obvious that no other faculty of cognition can do this. The law of causality conveys only the idea that the perception of the outside world. Changed under my eyes the discovered object to the law of causality only serves to seek the cause of the new change in the sensory organ, not the change in the object: it is as if a whole new thing would have exercised in itself an effect on me.

So due to the causality law, we can never, for example, for the cause of the movement of a branch that was previously motionless, wondering. We can only due to the movement thereof perceive and only because itself, in which the movement has changed my sense organ by the transition of the branch from the state of rest.

Can we not ask for the cause of the movement of the branch now? Certainly we can do it, but only on the basis of universal causality, a compound of the reason *a posteriori* ; because only through this we can see the influence of object to object while the Causalitätsgesetz i 25 , only the threads between subject and object spins itself.

So we ask because quite rightly the cause of the movement of the branch. We find them in the wind. we like it so we can ask first for the cause of the wind, then so on for the cause of this cause, that we can make causality ranks.

But what happened when I asked for the cause of the moving branch and found the same? I jumped as if from the tree and took a different object, the wind. And what happened when I found the cause of the wind? I just left the wind and stand for something completely different, such as when sunlight or heat.

It follows very clearly:

- 1) that the application of the general causality always derived from things in themselves,
- 2) that causality ranks only linking efficiencies of things in themselves, that is never self-contained things as members in itself.

Let us try to pursue further (every man for himself) the broken up in the heat causality series further, it is clearly apparent to everyone, that it

- 3) is also difficult to form proper Causalreihen, as it seems to be slightly in the first moments, so that it is for the subject quite impossible, starting from any change, a proper causal series *a parte ante* produce which an unimpeded progress *in indefinitum* would.

Things in themselves are therefore never in a causality row, and I can for the cause of being a thing in itself neither by the hand of the causality law, to ask the hand of the general causality; because a thing changed about him that I virtue of the causality law've found as an object, and I wonder virtue of the general causality of the cause of the change, the general causality leads me immediately from the thing itself from flat. The question: what is the cause of a thing in itself in the world, must not only but they can not be made at all.

i 26 It is evident that never lead to the past of things in us the causal relationships, and it shows an incredible lack of reflection, when one considers the so-called infinite causal series for the best weapon against the known three proofs of God's existence. It is the dullest weapon that there can be, yes she is not holding a weapon: it is the Lichtenberg's knife.

And strange! Just what makes this weapon to nothing, which also makes the imaginary evidence untenable, namely the causality. Opponents of the evidence claim frischweg: the chain of causality is endless, without even ever just trying to make a series of fifty right limbs; and the originator of the evidence made easily, the things of this world to members of a causal series and then ask extremely

naive about the cause of the world. Two parties is as above to explain: The general causality never leads into the past of things in themselves.

The seed is not the cause of a plant; for seed and plant are in no causal but in a genetic connection. In contrast, you can ask for the causes which brought the seed in the ground to germinate, or the causes which made the fußhohe plant to such six feet high. but you answered these questions, so everyone will find what we have found above, namely: that each of these causes is derived from the plant. Finally, you will find the plant completely cocooned in members of Causalreihen, but where they never appear as a member.

Is there now no means to be able to penetrate into the past of things? The aforementioned genetic relationship between seed and plant answers the question in the affirmative. Reason can form series of developments, which are something quite different from Causalreihen. These are created with the help of causality, those only with the help of time. Causality rows are the concatenated effectiveness is not one but many things; Development series, however it have to do with being a thing in itself and its modifications. This result is very important.

i 27

24th

Let us now, based on the natural science, in this single path, which leads into the past of the things on, so we must reduce all rows organic forces on the chemical forces (carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen, oxygen, iron, phosphorus, etc.) , That we will succeed, even these simple chemical forces, the so-called simple substances, due to a few forces, is an unshakable conviction of most naturalists. However, it is for our investigation quite immaterial whether this will happen or not, because it is an irrefutable truth that we will never reach immanent areas on the multitude out of the unit. It is therefore clear that we would not take only three simple chemical forces as hundreds or thousands. So let's stop at the number, which still angiebt us the science of our day. In contrast, we find in our thinking not only no obstacle, but even logical necessity to bring the multiplicity least on their simplest expression, duality, because the reason is what is all objects to basically force, and what would be more natural than that they, their function exercising, even for the present and valid all future associations the forces to a metaphysical unity? Not the varied effectiveness of forces could prevent them, because it has only the general, the effectiveness absolutely every thing is in itself, in the eye, that is the essential equality of all forces, and their function but solely the fact that diverse Similar that übergiebt to her judgment, connect.

We must, however, their not give here, but must, speaking the truth glancing, preserve the sanity by strong curb in front of a safe fall. I repeat: we can on immanent field, in this world, never about the multiplicity addition. Even in the past, we must, as a bona fide researchers who multiplicity not destroy, and must at least remain at the logical duality. Nevertheless, the reason can not stop, over and over again to point out the necessity of a single unit. Their argument is that already mentioned, that for all | i 28 forces, which we consider separately, as forces are essentially identical to the deepest reason and therefore should not be separated. What is to be done in this dilemma? This much is clear: the truth must not be denied and the immanent area must be preserved in all its purity. There is only one way out. In the past, we are already. So we can because the last forces that we were not allowed to touch it, if we did not want to be visionaries come together to transscendentem areas. There is a past, Gewesenes, sunken area, and with it, the simple unity has passed and gone down.

25th

By fused multiplicity to unity, we have destroyed the power above all; because the force is only valid and meaning on immanent regions in the world. Already from this it follows is that we can form no conception, let a term us of the essence of a primeval unity. Clearly, however, the total unknowable this

antediluvian unit when we all all a priori functions and forms and *a posteriori* derived compounds of our mind, one after the other, before they lead. She is the head of Medusa, before they solidify all.

First, the sense refuse to work; because they can react only to the effectiveness of a force and the unit does not act as force. Then the mind remains completely inactive. Here, yes basically just here, has a saying: the mind stands still in full force. Neither he can apply his law of causality because no sensation exists, nor can he use his shapes space and matter, because it lacks a table of contents for these forms. Then the reason collapses unconscious. What should she join? What you use is the synthesis? what their form, the present, which is missing the real point of the exercise? What do you avails the time, to even be something that the real succession as support needs? What should the simple unit to start over with the general causality, whose job it is, the effectiveness of a thing in itself, as the cause, with the action to another to link the effect? can | i 29 they use the important link community where simultaneous entanglement of various forces, a dynamic context does not exist, but where a simple unit aligns the inscrutable Sphinx eyes on them? What should ultimately benefit the substance that is the ideal substrate of various effectiveness of many powers?

And so they weaken all!

We can thus determine the simple unity only negative, and indeed, on our present positions, as: inactive, ausdehnungslos indiscriminately, not cut fragmented (easy), motionless, timeless (forever).

But let's not forget, and we are sticking right that this mysterious, utterly unrecognizable simple unit has set with its

transcendental areas and no longer exists. At this knowledge, we want to raise us up and returned us go with fresh courage to the existing area, which alone is valid, clear and distinct world.

26th

It follows from the foregoing that Sämtliche development series, we like to go out of whatever we want, *a parte ante* in a transcendent unity lead which our knowledge completely closed, an X Nothing is the same, and we can therefore say quite clearly that the world was created out of nothing. However, as we on the one hand this unit a positive predicate, the need of existence attach, although we can not form the allerärmlichsten term us on the nature of this existence, and our reason is simply impossible on the other hand, think of a creation out of nothing, so we are dealing with a relative nothingness (*nihil privativum* to do), which can be described as a past, incomprehensible primordial, in which everything is contained in a us incomprehensible way.

From this it follows here:

1) that Sämtliche development series have a beginning, (which by the way already follows from the concept development with logical necessity);

2) that it is therefore no infinite Causalreihen *a parte ante* can give;

i 30 3) that all forces are created; because what they transscendentem on areas in which simple unit were that eludes our knowledge completely. Only we can say that they had the very existence. Furthermore, we can say categorically that they were not in the simple power unit; because the force is the nature, *essentia*, a thing in itself to continuous performance areas. But what was the simple unit in which nevertheless Everything exists contain the essence was to - that is, as we have seen clearly veiled our minds with an impenetrable veil for all time.

The transcendent area is in fact no longer exists. But if we go with the imagination back in time to the beginning of the inherent territory, we can figuratively represent the transcendent next to the immanent field. But then both separates a gap that can never be exceeded by any means of the Spirit. Only one thin filaments bridges the bottomless abyss: it is the existence. We can do this on thin filaments all the forces of immanent domain to the transcendent over: this load can wear it. But once the forces have

arrived on the far field, they also listen to, to be forces for human thought, and therefore the important theorem:

But although all that is, was not created out of nothing, but vorweltlich already existed, so is all that is, any force just emerged as a force, that she had a definite beginning.

27th

So to these results we get when we go back from any current being in his past. Now we want to check the behavior of things on the continued rolling points of the present.

First, we look into the inorganic realm, the realm of simple chemical forces, such as oxygen, chlorine, iodine, copper etc. As far as our experience goes, the case has never occurred, that any one of these forces, shown in the same circumstances, other properties have; well, no case be known i 31 where a chemical force had been destroyed. Do I come sulfur in all possible connections and come out of all possible again, he shows his old properties again and his Quantum is neither increased, nor been reduced; at least everyone in the latter regard, the unshakable certainty is that it is so, and rightly so: for nature is the only source of truth, and their statements are to be considered alone. Never lie, and asked about the issue at hand, she answers every time that there is no simple chemical force can pass.

Nevertheless, we must admit that this statement against skeptical attacks can be made. What they wanted to me then respond when I generally attacking and without mentioning even a single feature in the matter, resulting in the transience which objektivirenden force could be closed in it, as said: It is true that until now no case has become known where a simple substance had been destroyed; but you are allowed to say that will teach the experience in the future of all the same? Is it possible to *a priori* anything to say about the power? Not at all; because the force is, the real thing is totally independent of the knowing subject in itself. The mathematician may well in the wild of limitations of the mathematical space - pulling sets of unconditional validity of the formal of things in themselves, because of the mathematical space underlying point room has the ability - whether it is equal only in our imagination auseinanderzutreten in three dimensions, and because every thing is extended itself in three dimensions. It is also no matter whether I speak of a certain real succession in the nature of a thing in itself, or whether I translate the same in the ideal succession, that they bring in a Zeitverhältnis; because the ideal Succession keeps pace with the real. But the naturalist must Nothing from the nature of the ideal connection infer substance, which would affect the force; because I can not repeat often enough that the essence of matter in every respect, *toto genere*, is different from the nature of the force, although these until it pulls the trigger smallest their properties exactly in the matter. Where are touching the real power and the ideal material, since it is precisely the important point, from where the i 32 border between the ideal and the real has to be drawn where the difference between object and thing in itself, between appearance and cause of the phenomenon, between the world as representation and of the world as a force is evident.

As long as the world is, as long as things will be extended to her in three directions; as long as the world is, as long as this power spheres will move; but you know because what new - (new for you, not emerging) - laws of nature you will be discovered later experience that will make you appear in a whole new light the essence of power? For it is rock solid, that on the inner nature of the force never *a priori* But a statement is always possible only on the basis of experience. but euere experience complete? Do you take already all laws of nature in your hand?

What did you answer me?

That now even those skeptical attacks on the above sentence can be made, should we agree very careful and determine us, the question for physics, and especially for metaphysics in which the threads of all our investigations are converging on purely immanent areas open to keep. But here, in the analysis, where we the thing is opposed to itself as something very general, where we therefore take the lowest

point of the thing in itself, we must unconditionally the statement of the nature that a simple chemical force never fades cheap, , however, we take a chemical compound, such as hydrogen sulfide, this force is already transitory. It is neither sulfur nor hydrogen, but a third, a fixed self-contained power sphere, but a destructible force. Dismantle I put them in the ground forces, it is destroyed. Now where is this peculiar force a very specific, both as different impression made from hydrogen to me from the sulfur? She's dead, and we can think that this compound at all, under certain circumstances, from the appearance of always occur to us quite well.

In the organic realm consistently Same is the case. The difference between the chemical compound and the organism will occupy us in physics; Here it does not concern us nothing. each | i 33 -organism is composed of simple chemical forces, such as sulfur and hydrogen sulfide in a single higher, entirely closed and uniform, force are canceled. We bring an organism in the chemical laboratory and examine it, we will always, he was an animal or a plant found only simple chemical forces in it.

Now what does the nature when we ask them about living in an organism higher power? She says the power is there, as long as the organism lives. he dissolves, so the power is dead. Another testimony she gives off not because they can not. It is a testimony of the utmost importance, which can rotate only a darkened mind. The death of an organism, the tied up in forces are free again without the slightest loss, but the force that dominated the chemical forces since then, is dead. Should they still live apart from them? Where's the hydrogen sulfide destroyed? where the higher power of the burned plant or animal slain? They float between heaven and earth? They flew on a star of the Milky

Way? The nature, the only source of truth alone can provide information, and nature says they are dead. Impossible as it is for us to think of a creation out of nothing, so easily we can think destroys us all organisms and all chemical compounds forever.

From these considerations, we draw the following results:

- 1) are all simple chemical forces, as far as our experience goes far, indestructible;
- 2) all chemical compounds and all organic forces, however, are destructible.

The confusion of substance with the chemical simple forces is as old as philosophy itself the law of the permanence of substance is.:

"The substance is uncreated and eternal."

According to our investigations, the substance is an ideal link, due to the a priori form of the understanding of matter, and the nature of a totality of forces. The intended law would read in our language: All the forces in the world are uncreated and eternal.

We have however, found in good research:

- i 34 1) that all forces are without exception, originated;
- 2) that only a few forces are immortal.

At the same time we made to reconsider this eternity of simple chemical forces in physics and metaphysics the reservation.

28th

We have seen that every thing has a force sphere itself, and that the same not a vain pretense is that the a priori form of the understanding space conjures up its own resources. We have also, of extremely important means of linking community recognized that these forces are at the deepest dynamic context, and thus arrived at a totality of forces in a tightly closed Collectiv unit. But hereby we maintained the finiteness of the universe, which is to establish closer now. Will we previously clear about the importance of the matter. Not a closed finite intrinsic region which would be surrounded on all sides by an infinite transcendental, it is; but because the transcendent area no longer exists in fact, a alone does existirendes immanent, which is to be finite.

How can these seemingly audacious claim to be justified? We only have two paths before us. Either we provide evidence with the help of imagination, or purely logical. - The point room is, as I said above, the same complacent to give a grain of sand and a palace the border. The only condition is that it such, will solicitirt from a reproducirten sensation of a thing in itself, or, failing. Now we have a present world: our earth among us, and the starry sky above us, and a naive mind it therefore may well seem that the idea of a finite world is possible. Science, however, destroys this illusion. Every day it extends the power sphere of the universe, or, more subjective, forcing daily point space of the mind to extend its three dimensions. The world is therefore the time being immeasurably great, that the mind can you still put no limit. Whether it will reach it, we must leave undecided. We must therefore refrain from outer space on a small scale in a similar manner | i 35 to make clear how we can make by plastic replica of the earth's surface the design of our earth we comprehensible, and there have even to say that we do not get in the way of presentation to the goal, so they can not prove clearly reflect the finite nature of the world , Thus, we only the inexorable logic remains.

And, in fact, she finds it very easy to prove the finiteness of the world.

The universe is not a single power, a single entity but a totality of finite power spheres. Now I can not give to this force spheres an infinite expansion; because first of all I would thus destroy the concept itself, then make the majority of the singular, that is the experience hit in the face. In addition to a single infinite no other force sphere has more space, and the essence of nature would simply be canceled. but a totality of finite power spheres must necessarily be finite.

Against this objection would be that, although found only finite forces in the world, but that an infinite number of finite forces are present, therefore, the world is no totality, but it is infinite.

Then must be answered: All forces of the world are either simple chemical forces, or combinations of such. The former are to include organizations and all connections are due to these few simple forces. Infinite, can not be a simple force as set forth above, if we may use any summarily described as immensely large. Consequently, the world, basically, the sum of the basic forces that finally all, that the world is finite.

Why now something over and over again leans forward to against this outcome? Because reason with the mind molding space drives abuse. The space is only significant for the experience; he's just a condition *a priori* the possibility of experience, a means to detect the outside world. The reason is, as we have seen, only entitled to enter on its own space apart (as you press the pen of a stick sword) if it reproduces or for mathematics pure intuition of space | i 36 has to produce. It is clear that the mathematician has such a space necessary only in the smallest dimensions to demonstiren his Sämtliche evidence; but it is also clear that just making the mathematical space for the mathematician is the rock on which the reason is perverse and commits the abuse. Because if we logically secure finiteness of the world (like so well it go up) to capture the image of endeavor us and let come to room for this purpose apart so immediately perverse reason causes the space, its dimensions beyond the borders of the world beyond to expand. Then the lawsuit is heard: we do have a finite world, but in a space that we can never finish because the dimensions extend constantly (or rather, although we have a finite worldbut in absolute nothingness). Against this there is only one agent. We have to base ourselves firmly on the logical finite nature of the world and to the knowledge that is a thing of thought to a limitless mathematical space with positive advanced point-space exists in our heads alone and has no reality. In this way, we are like immune and resist with critical prudence to the temptation to exaggerate lonely lust with our spirit and to betray the truth there.

29th

Likewise, only critical prudence can keep us ahead of other great dangers, which I will explain now.

As it is in the nature of the dot space that the zero *in indefinitum* occurs in three dimensions apart, so it is also in his nature to be any any pure (mathematical) space are becoming smaller, until the point space, that is zero. As the worm their feelers, he pulls his dimensions in back and is again unthätige mind form. This subjective ability, called space, can not be thought of differently constituted, because it is a condition of the possibility of experience alone predisposed to the outside world, without which it has no meaning.

Now, however, as a matter of fact, the objects set the line as objects, on the other hand also help It is necessary to grasp the totality of all things in themselves, the universe, and to be unlimited in progression, as well as in retreating to zero. if she had a limit to the separation, she could not shape a real sphere of power beyond that frontier; and if it had a limit to retreat before zero, then all those spheres of force would be for our knowledge, which would lie between zero and this limit. In the last section we saw that reason with the immensity of the point-space drift abuse in divergence and could reach a finite universe in an infinite space. Now we have to light the abuse, the reason drives with the limitlessness of space in the back falls to zero, or in other words, we stand before the infinite divisibility of mathematical space.

Let us imagine a pure space, such as a cubic inch, we can use this *in indefinitum* share, ie the recession of dimensions in the zero point is always prevented. We may share many years, centuries, millennia - always, we are faced with a remaining space that can be divided again and so on *ad infinitum* . This is the basis of the so-called infinite divisibility mathematical space, as on the divergence *in infinitum* of the dot space the infinity of the mathematical space based.

But what we do, by starting from a certain space and they divide restless? We play with fire, we are big kids, each Prudent to beat on the fingers. Or is not comparable to that of children who, handle futile in the absence of parents, a loaded pistol that has a very specific purpose, our method? The space is intended only for the knowledge of the outside world; he should limit each thing in itself, it was as big as the Mont Blanc, or as small as a infusoria: that is his purpose as that of the loaded gun to stretch a burglar to the ground. Now we solve the room from the outside world and make him |

i 38 by a dangerous toy, or as I have above, according Pückler, said: We drive with our spirit "lonely lust."

30th

The division *in indefinitum* of a given pure space, incidentally, has so far an innocent side as a thought-entity, a space which is located in the head of the part ends and has no reality, is divided. Its danger is, however, doubled if the infinite divisibility of mathematical space, almost sacrilegious, is transferred to the force, the thing in itself. The punishment follows the nonsensical begin immediately on the heels: the logical contradiction. Each chemical force is divisible; against this nothing can be objected, because that experience teaches. But it does not consist of parts before the division is not an aggregate of parts, because the parts are only really in the division itself. The chemical force is a homogeneous simple force of quite the same intensity and then based its divisibility, ie each detached portion is , by its nature, not the whole of the at least different. Now we see the real division from which both the nature its laws, and the man in plan of work accomplished to practischem benefits, and their results are always certain force sphere, so remains the idle frivolous division.

The perverse reason some take a portion of a chemical force, such as a cubic inch iron, and informs him continually in thought, constantly *in indefinitum* , and finally gaining the conviction that they never, they want to share even trillions of years, came to an end. At the same time you say the logic that a cubic inch of iron, so a finite force sphere that could not possibly be composed of an infinite number of parts, so that it is completely inadmissible at all to speak of infinitely many parts of an object; because

only in the unfettered activity *in indefinitum* a faculty of knowledge is the support for the concept of infinity, | i 39 here so the unimpeded progressus the division, never, never on real areas.

So into the cave the perverse reason can at the hands of the restless division, but, once in, it must also always forward. Back to the finite power sphere from which they went out, they can not. In this desperate situation she breaks away from their leader violently off and postulated the atom, that is a force sphere that should no longer be divisible.

Of course, they can now, through concatenation of such atoms, for cubic inch iron back, but at what cost: it has set itself in contradiction with itself!

Will the thinker remain honest, he must be prudent. The prudence is the only weapon against the abuse that feels like driving a perverse reason with our faculty of knowledge. In the present case is therefore not provided by us on real areas of the divisibility of the chemical forces in question. But we balk us with all his might, first, of the infinite divisibility of forces because such a can be claimed only if, in the most amazing way to the thing in the (also abused) being a faculty of knowledge is transmitted; secondly, the composition of the force from parts. So we reject the infinite divisibility of the force and the atom.

As I said above, a faculty of knowledge, which will put all the forces that can occur in an experience that borders must necessarily be such that it can come apart without restriction and on the way back to zero, no border encounters. Let it, however, on one side, ie detached from the experience for which it is determined alone, and make conclusions which we drew from its nature, binding on the thing in itself, we fall into contradiction with the pure reason: one great evil!

31st

We have finally to escape even with a critical spirit a danger that rises out of time.

The time is, as we know, an ideal combination , *a posteriori* , won on the basis of a priori form of presence | i 40 and is nothing without the basis of the real succession. With their powerful leadership, we reached the top of the world, to the border of a lost antediluvian existence of the transcendent area. Here she passes out, here it ends in a past eternity, which word is merely a subjective term for the lack of any and all real succession.

The critical reason is content; not so perverse reason. This calls time again into life back and goads them *into indefinitum* weiterzueilen without real support, regardless of the prevailing eternity.

Here lies naked than anywhere abuse to light, which can be made with a faculty of cognition. Empty moments are constantly connected and a line continues, which until transcendent areas probably had a solid, reliable basis, the real development, but now hovers in the air.

We have to do here nothing else than to rely on pure reason and simply prohibit the foolish goings.

Now if *a parte ante* real movement whose subjective scale is the time alone, had a beginning, it is therefore by no means to say that they *a parte post* must have an end. The solution to this problem depends on the answer to the question: the simple chemical forces are indestructible? For it is clear that the real movement must be endless if the simple chemical forces are indestructible.

So it follows: 1) that the real movement has taken an initial; 2) that the real movement is endless. The latter judgment we make with the reservation of a revision in physics and metaphysics.

32nd

These studies and the earlier of our faculty of knowledge justify I am convinced the real transcendental or critical idealism, not alone but really can with words to things in their empirical reality, that they stretch and movement, independent of the subject, of space and time, grants. His main | point i 41 is located in the material objectifying force, and it is transcendental in this respect, which word denotes the dependence of the object from the subject.

He is critical idealism against it because he perverted reason (*perversa ratio* curbs) and does not allow her:

- a. to misuse the causality for the preparation of infinite series;
- b. the time of their indispensable basis, the real development to replace and turn them into a line of empty moments that come from infinity and hurries into infinity;
- c . the mathematical space and the substance for keeping things as mere thoughts more, and
- d . In addition to impute absolute insistence that real space infinity and this real substance.

Furthermore, the critical idealism even less the perverse reason allows the arbitrary transmission of such chimeras to things in themselves and annulled their bold statements:

- a. the pure existence of things fall into the endless Causalreihen;
- b. the universe is infinite and chemical forces are divisible in infinitum, or they are an aggregate of atoms;
- c . the World Development had no beginning;
- d . All forces are indestructible.

The two propositions which we had to make:

- 1) the simple chemical forces are indestructible,
 - 2) the development of the world has no end,
- we declared in need of revision.

As an important positive result we have then to lead that brought us the transcendental idealism to a transcendent areas that can not harass the researchers, because it no longer exists.

In this way the critical idealism freed every honest and loyal nature observation of inconsistencies and fluctuations and makes the nature again the only source of all truth that no one, attracted by deception shapes and mirages, impunity leaves: for he must perish in the desert.

i 42

A guy who speculated,
Is like an animal on barren heath,
led by an evil spirit around in circles,
And all around is beautiful green pasture.
(Goethe.)

33rd

The most important for our further investigations result of the previous is that things in themselves for the subject substantial objects, independent of the subject, moving forces with a certain effectiveness sphere are. We acquired it through careful analysis of the outward faculty of cognition, so completely on the ground of the objective world; because we had the extra time on the way to the inside as well have produced in our consciousness of other things in our body or but more than the knowledge that the thing the object underlying itself is a force of a certain extent and having a certain mobility can not be obtained on the way to the outside. What the force and is in itself as Am working as they move up - this all we can not see outside. The inherent philosophy would have to conclude here, if we were only knowing subject; because what they would testify due to this one-sided truth about the art, about the actions of men and the movement of all mankind, would be of doubtful value: it could be and could not be so short it would lose the safe ground below and all courage, and, therefore, would have to cancel their research.

But the way out is not the only one who is open to us. We can penetrate into the very heart of power; because every person belongs to nature, is itself a force and that a self-conscious force. The essence of the force must be recognized in self-consciousness.

So we want to draw from the second source of experience, self-confidence because now.

We immerse ourselves in our inner being, so listen to the senses and the mind, the outward faculty of knowledge, | i 43 entirely to function on itself; they will be posted as it were, and only the upper faculty of cognition remain in action. We have no impressions to which we would have to look for a different cause of them only in the interior; we can also internally not make space and are completely immaterial, that is in us the law of causality does not apply and we are free from space and matter.

Although we are completely non-spatial now, that can not get to view a form of our interior, we are therefore not a mathematical point. We feel our effectiveness sphere just as far as she goes, just missing us to make it the means. Until the very tips of our body the common feeling of force is sufficient, and we are not concentrated in one point, nor deliquescent *in indefinitum* , but in a certain sphere. This sphere I shall call from now on the real individuality: it is the first cornerstone of a purely immanent philosophy. We examine ourselves further, we find ourselves, as stated above, in perpetual motion. Our strength is essential resting and restless. Never, not even for the duration of the smallest part, of a moment, we are in absolute peace; because silence is death, and the smallest possible interruption of life would *Verlöschung* the flame of life. We are so much restless; However, we feel only in motion in self-consciousness.

The state of our innermost being touched as it always, as a real point of the movement, consciousness, or floats, as I said earlier, the presence at the point of the movement. Our inner life, we are always conscious in the present. If, however, the presence of the main thing and stands therefore the point of movement on it, so my being would have during each intermittency of my self-consciousness (in blackouts during sleep) total rest, that death would hit it and it could not re-ignite his life. The assumption that really the point of the movement of the present (the real movement of the time) is dependent, how that space things lend expansion, as absurd as it necessary for the | i 44 was course of development of philosophy, which I want to express that it can not give a higher degree of absurdity.

By now the reason of transition from present is aware of the present, she wins the earlier discussed ways that time and at the same time the real succession, which I by now, in relation to the real individuality, will call the real movement: it is the second pillars of the inherent philosophy.

It is the greatest deception in which one can be biased if one believes, on the way to the inside, we would like on the way to the outside, knowing and the knower would be a Detected opposite. We are in the middle of things in themselves, from an object can no longer be any question, and we immediately grasp the core of our being, by selfconsciousness, the feeling. It is an immediate awareness of our being by the Spirit, or rather by the sensitivity.

So what is the core of our Inside there *entschleiende* force? It is the will to live.

Whenever we enter also the way in - we may find ourselves in apparent calm and indifference, we may be saved tremble under the kiss of beauty, we may rush and run around in the wildest passion or melt into pity, we like "sky high shout" or "be sad" to death - we are always will to live. We want to be there, always be there; because we want to existence, we are and because we want to existence, we remain in existence. The will to live is the innermost core of our being; he is always active, though often not on the surface. To be convinced of this, to bring the weary individual in real danger of death and the will to live will reveal themselves, carrying on all trains with terrible clarity the desire for existence: his hunger for life is insatiable.

But if man really do not want this life, he annihilated immediately by deeds. Most wish for death, they do not want him. This desire is a developing individuality, which is identical to the found external moving effectiveness sphere. But he is thoroughly devoid of matter. |

i 45 This immediate apprehension of the force on his way to the inside and free of matter I consider to seal that expresses the nature under my epistemology. Not the space, not the time to distinguish the

thing in itself from the object, but the matter alone makes the object to a mere phenomenon which is related to the knowing subject and falls.

As the most important outcome of the analysis, we consider the totally independent from the subject individual moving will to live firmly in hand. He is the key that leads into the heart of physics, aesthetics, ethics, politics and metaphysics.